

EDITORIAL.

ONE THING is especially true of American botany—it is vigorous and progressive. The evidences of accelerating growth may reasonably support hopes of a future development as profound, even if not as massive, as Germany now possesses. We are of a mind with our German correspondent (whose views on this and other points carry all the more weight by being taken from a letter not written for publication), that time will bring us college faculties in botany, with all implied improvements and accompaniments, where we now have isolated teachers. It is, indeed, quite possible to establish a few laboratories and lecture rooms in emulation of the best the world knows, if men of erudition and indomitable energy are willing to devote themselves to the work, and can secure the backing of sufficiently large and wealthy institutions, yet to see the science acknowledged as an essential part of a general education, which is now true in a limited sense only, there must exist the conviction in the public mind that it is of greater importance than other studies which it displaces. Public attention is much more directed toward the useful at the present time than what is simply interesting. It will be good policy, therefore, for botanists to pay regard to those subjects which affect the thought and welfare of the people. In passing this way the dangerous ground of superficiality must be sedulously avoided, for our plea is not for popularity at the expense of science, but for the advancement of science by the aid of the good will of the people. Let the botany, presented by botanists, take hold of problems of human welfare and philosophy in a masterly way, and the public will not fail to show appreciation by lending its support to the advancement of the science as a whole.

OPEN LETTERS.

Anatomical Botany.

I am half inclined to take exceptions to an editorial in the GAZETTE for November, 1886, *a propos* of physiologists *versus* systematists. It seems to me that you rather ignored another group of workers, for want of a better name, anatomists. There is an immense amount of structural work, in fact, all morphological work, embryology, etc., which, to my mind, can not properly be brought under the head of physiology, and which certainly does not belong to the domain of systematic botany. Now it seems to me that just here is a great field open for our American botanists, in which very little expensive apparatus, aside from the microscope, is required. It is not all of it easy work, but certainly there is enough to be done to satisfy the most ardent of those same young enthusiasts of whom you speak, who set out to reorganize the whole science.

Bonn.

DOUGLAS H. CAMPBELL,